



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/559,385	06/21/2006	Werner Mederski	MERCK-3107	5930
23599 7590 05/26/2009 MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO & BRANIGAN, P.C. 2200 CLARENDON BLVD. SUITE 1400 ARLINGTON, VA 22201				
EXAMINER ANDERSON, REBECCA L				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1626				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/26/2009		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@mwzb.com

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/559,385

**Applicant(s)**

MEDERSKI ET AL.

**Examiner**

REBECCA L. ANDERSON

**Art Unit**

1626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/55/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/6/2005
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-15 are currently pending in the instant application. Claims 1-15 are rejected and claim 6 is objected.

#### *Claim Objections*

Claim 6 is objected to because of the following informalities: Specifically, claim 6 has a typographical error as the term "compound" is spelled "compo unds", i.e. there is a space in the middle of the word. Appropriate correction is required.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

As stated in the MPEP 2164.01 (a), "There are many factors to be considered when determining whether there is sufficient evidence to support a determination that a disclosure does not satisfy the enablement requirement and whether any necessary experimentation is "undue."

In In re Wands, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (1988), factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure meets the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, have need described. They are:

1. the nature of the invention,
2. the state of the prior art,
3. the predictability or lack thereof in the art,
4. the amount of direction or guidance present,
5. the presence or absence of working examples,
6. the breadth of the claims,
7. the quantity of experimentation needed, and
8. the level of the skill in the art.

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the products and methods of preparing of products of the formula I and pharmaceutically usable salts and stereoisomers thereof does not reasonably provide enablement for the derivatives and solvates thereof. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make/use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

***The nature of the invention***

In the instant case, the claims are read as products and methods of preparation of products of the formula I and pharmaceutically usable derivatives, solvates, salts and stereoisomers thereof.

***The state of the prior art and the predictability or lack thereof in the art***

In regards to solvates and hydrates, according to Byrn, et al., "the occurrence of hydrated or solvated crystal forms, crystals in which solvent molecules occupy regular positions in the crystal structure, is widespread but *by no means universal among drug substances*." (emphasis added). Byrn, et al. "Solid State Chemistry of Drugs", 2d ed., SSCI, Inc., Ch. 10 Polymorphs, pp. 232-247, 232 (1999). Most drug crystals that fall into the category of solvates are hydrates. *Id.* at 236.

While the level of skill in pharmacology and organic chemistry is exceedingly high, there is no absolute predictability as to which solvates will function as intended. Byrn notes that the water molecule is particularly suited to fill structural voids, due to its small size. *Id.* In hydrated crystal structures, water molecules bind to other water

molecules but also to any available functional group, i.e. carbonyls, amines, alcohols, and many others which are capable of accepting or donating an active hydrogen atom to form hydrogen bonds. *Id.* Also, the behavior of hydrates of pharmaceuticals is unpredictable due to dehydration prior to melting, and cracking during dehydration. *Id.* at 234. Too, hydrates and solvates may only be formed under certain conditions, dependent upon the compounds sought to be crystallized. Such a process is not a given in pharmacology and requires a great deal of research, with no guarantee of success.

Furthermore, the stability of solvates and hydrates is not altogether predictable, wherein said stability directly affects the properties of a given molecule. This lack of stability means a hydrate or solvate, if found to possess similar properties as the target compound, may not function as intended *in vivo*. Such facts lead to the conclusion that more than a mere recitation is needed in order to support a claim to solvates and hydrates. Creating functional solvates and hydrates with the same properties as the mother-compound is by no means routine, thus there must be a showing sufficient to satisfy the enablement requirement.

The state of the prior art is that the term "derivative" is a compound, usually organic obtained from another compound by a simple chemical process or an organic compound containing a structural radical similar to that from which it is derived. Applicant has not provided what similar radicals are encompassed by the instant claims.

***The amount of direction or guidance present and the presence or absence of working examples***

The only direction or guidance present is for the use of products, salts and stereoisomers.

***The breadth of the claims***

The breadth of the claims includes products, salts, derivatives, stereoisomers and solvates thereof.

***The quantity of experimentation needed and the level of the skill in the art***

The level of difficulty required to produce functional hydrates and solvates is extremely high. The level of skill in pharmacology/organic chemistry is also very high. However, despite such a high level of skill in the requisite art, the creation of solvates and hydrates is unpredictable to the extent that undue experimentation is required in order to make and use solvates and hydrates of the claimed compounds. There is an insufficient showing in the Specification, or the state of the art does not acknowledge that the solvates and hydrates of the claimed compounds can be created via routine experimentation.

Therefore, Applicant's Specification does not enable one of ordinary skill in the art to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with the claims.

Claims 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

As stated in the MPEP 2164.01 (a), "There are many factors to be considered when determining whether there is sufficient evidence to support a determination that a disclosure does not satisfy the enablement requirement and whether any necessary experimentation is "undue."

In In re Wands, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (1988), factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure meets the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, have need described. They are:

1. the nature of the invention,
2. the state of the prior art,
3. the predictability or lack thereof in the art,
4. the amount of direction or guidance present,
5. the presence or absence of working examples,
6. the breadth of the claims,
7. the quantity of experimentation needed, and
8. the level of the skill in the art.

In the instant case,

### ***The nature of the invention***

The nature of the invention of claims 13 and 15 include the intended use for the treatment of a variety of diseases such as the treatment of tumours. Furthermore, the instant claims cover 'diseases' that are known to exist and those that may be discovered in the future, for which there is no enablement provided.

### ***The state of the prior art and the predictability or lack thereof in the art***

The state of the prior art is that the pharmacological art involves screening in vitro and in vivo to determine which compounds exhibit the desired pharmacological activities (i.e. what compounds can treat which specific diseases by what mechanism).

There is no absolute predictability even in view of the seemingly high level of skill in the art. The existence of these obstacles establishes that the contemporary knowledge in the art would prevent one of ordinary skill in the art from accepting any therapeutic regimen on its face.

The instant claimed invention is highly unpredictable as discussed below:

It is noted that the pharmaceutical art is unpredictable, requiring each embodiment to be individually assessed for physiological activity. In re Fisher, 427 F.2d 833, 166 USPQ 18 (CCPA 1970) indicates that the more unpredictable an area is, the more specific enablement is necessary in order to satisfy the statute.

Applicants are claiming the intended use of therapy which includes the treatment of various diseases such as tumours.

Applicants claims are for the intended use of therapy such as the treatment of various tumours. The state of the prior art is that cancer therapy remains highly unpredictable. The various types of cancers have different causative agents, involve different cellular mechanisms, and consequently, differ in treatment protocol. It is known that the challenge of cancer treatment has been to target specific therapies to pathogenetically distinct tumor types, that cancer classification has been based primarily on morphological appearance of the tumor and that tumors with similar histopathological appearance can follow significantly different clinical courses and show different responses to therapy (Golub et al. page 531) Furthermore, it is known that chemotherapy is most effective against tumors with rapidly dividing cells and that cells of solid tumors divide relatively slowly and chemotherapy is often less effective against



them. It is also known in the prior art (Lala et al. page 91) that the role of NO in tumor biology remains incompletely understood with both the promotion and inhibition of NO mentioned for the treatment of tumor progression and only certain human cancers may be treated by selected NO-blocking drugs. These example shows that there are different cellular mechanisms, the unpredictability in the art and the different treatment protocols.

Hence, in the absence of a showing of correlation between all the diseases claimed as capable of treatment by the administration of the compounds of the claims one of skill in the art is unable to fully predict possible results from the administration of the compound of the claims due to the unpredictability, for example, since it is known that the challenge of cancer treatment has been to target specific therapies to pathogenetically distinct tumor types, that cancer classification has been based primarily on morphological appearance of the tumor and that tumors with similar histopathological appearance can follow significantly different clinical courses and show different responses to therapy.

***The amount of direction or guidance present and the presence or absence of working examples***

The only direction or guidance present in the instant specification is the listing of diseases applicant considers as treatable on pages 4 and 5. In vitro data is discussed on page 21. However, the disclosure does not provide how the in vitro data correlates to the treatment of the assorted diseases claimed.

The uses covered by the claims are not enabled based solely on the assay testing reported in the specification. Various studies reported for compounds in clinical

development rely on animal models and not simply assay testing as done herein. Note Hoffman V. Klaus 9 USPQ2d 1657 regarding the standard of testing that is necessary to establish the likelihood of *in vivo* use. Also see *Ex parte Powers* 220 USPQ 925. Where the utility is unusual or difficult to treat or speculative, the examiner has authority to require evidence that tests relied on are reasonably predictive of *in vivo* efficacy by those skilled in the art. See for example, *In re Ruskin* 148 USPQ 221; *Ex parte Jovanovics* 211 USPQ 907. Any evidence relied on by applicants must clearly show a reasonable expectation of *in vivo* success for any additional diseases that may still be embraced in response to this action. See MPEP 2164.05(a).

Additionally, for example, in regards to the treatment of specific cancers, in general, cell culture studies are not considered, in the cancer arts, to be reliably predictive of effects in cancer treatment, in vitro assays cannot easily assess host-tumor and cell-cell interactions that may be important in the malignant state and cannot duplicate the complex conditions of in vivo therapy. This is because characteristics of cultured cell lines generally differ significantly from the characteristics of a primary tumor. Those of skill in the art recognize that *in vitro* assays are useful to screen the effects of agents on cells. However, clinical correlations are generally lacking. The greatly increased complexity of the *in vivo* environment as compared with the very narrowly defined and controlled conditions of an *in vitro* assay does not permit a simple extrapolation of *in vitro* assays to human therapeutic efficacy with any reasonable degree of predictability.

Further, there is no disclosure regarding how all types of diseases claimed having diverse mechanisms are treated. Receptor activity is generally unpredictable and a highly structure specific area, and the data provided of is insufficient for one of ordinary skill in the art in order to extrapolate to the other compounds of the claims. It is inconceivable as to how the claimed compounds can treat the extremely difficult diseases embraced by the instant claims.

Applicants have not provided any competent evidence or disclosed tests that are highly predictive for the pharmaceutical use of the instant compounds. Pharmacological activity in general is a very unpredictable area. Note that in cases involving physiological activity such as the instant case, "the scope of enablement obviously varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability of the factors involved." See *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970).

***The breadth of the claims***

The breadth of the claims is the intended use for the treatment of a variety of diseases and disorders.

***The quantity of experimentation needed***

The quantity of experimentation needed is undue experimentation. One of skill in the art would need to determine what diseases out of the multitude claimed would be benefited (treated) by the administration of the compound of the claims.

***The level of the skill in the art***

The level of skill in the art is high. However, due to the unpredictability in the pharmaceutical art, it is noted that each embodiment of the invention is required to be

individually assessed for physiological activity by in vitro and in vivo screening to determine which compounds exhibit the desired pharmacological activity and which diseases would benefit from this activity.

Thus, the specification fails to provide sufficient support of the broad use of the compound of the instant claims for the treatment of the various claimed diseases and disorders as a result necessitating one of skill to perform an exhaustive search for which disorders can be treated by what compounds of the instant claims in order to practice the claimed invention.

Thus, factors such as "sufficient working examples", "the level of skill in the art" and "predictability", etc. have been demonstrated to be sufficiently lacking in the instantly claimed methods. In view of the breadth of the claim, the chemical nature of the invention, and the lack of working examples regarding the activity of the claimed compounds, one having ordinary skill in the art would have to undergo an undue amount of experimentation to use the invention commensurate in scope with the claims.

Genentech Inc. v. Novo Nordisk A/S (CA FC) 42 USPQ2d 1001 , states that " a patent is not a hunting license. It is not a reward for search, but compensation for its successful conclusion" and "[p]atent protection is granted in return for an enabling disclosure of an invention, not for vague intimations of general ideas that may or may not be workable".

Therefore, in view of the Wands factors and In re Fisher (CCPA 1970) discussed above, to practice the claimed invention herein, a person of skill in the art would have to

engage in undue experimentation to test which diseases can be treated by the compound encompassed in the instant claims, with no assurance of success.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 13 and 15 provides for the use of compounds of the formula I according to claim 1 but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

Claims 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd. v. Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

### **Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Rebecca L. Anderson whose telephone number is (571) 272-0696. Mrs. Anderson can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 6:00am until 2:30pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Mr. Joseph K. McKane, can be reached at (571) 272-0699.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

*/Rebecca Anderson/  
Primary Examiner, AU 1626*

20 May 2009

---

Rebecca Anderson  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1626, Group 1620  
Technology Center 1600